

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 and 11-19 are pending in this application. By this response to the Office Action dated July 8, 2009, claims 1, 6, 8, and 11 are amended, and claim 10 is canceled without prejudice. Support for the amendments is found, for example, in FIGS. 1 and 2 of the application as filed. No new matter has been introduced. Favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the foregoing amendments and following comments is respectfully solicited.

In section 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 11, 19/1 (claim 19 as it depends on claim 1), and 19/11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0036601 (Obradovich) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,985,091 (Price). In section 3 of the Office Action, claims 4, 6, 7/6, and 19/6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich and Price in view U.S. Patent No. 6,356,207 (Oouchi). (*NOTE*: the Office Action still refers to claim 10/6, which is no longer pending). In section 4 of the Office Action, claims 14/6, 15/6, 16/15/6, 17/15/6, and 18/15/6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich, Price, and Oouchi in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0196134 (Lutter). In section 5 of the Office Action, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich, Price, and Oouchi in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0210228 (Ebersole). In section 6 of the Office Action, claims 8-10 and 19/8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich and Price in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,618,650 (Nakai). In section 7 of the Office Action, claims 14/8, 15/8, 16/15/8, 17/15/8, and 18/15/8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Price, Nakai, and Lutter. In section 8 of the Office

**Application No.: 10/586,340**

Action, claims 12/1 and 12/11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich and Price in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,394,332 (Kuwahara). In section 9 of the Office Action, claims 13/12/1 and 13/12/11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Price, Kuwahara, and U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0203951 (Mazzara). In section 10 of the Office Action, claims 14/1, 14/11, 15/1, 15/11, 16/15/1, 16/15/11, 17/15/1, 17/15/11, 18/15/1, and 18/15/11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich and Price in view of Lutter. On page 12 of the Office Action, claim 12/6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Price, Oouchi, Kuwahara, and Mazzara. (*NOTE*: in view of section 3 of the Office Action, it appears page 12, lines 1-3 incorrectly omits Price). In section 11 of the Office Action, claim 13/12/6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich, Price, Oouchi, and Kuwahara in view of Mazzara. In section 12 of the Office Action, claim 12/8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Price, Nakai, and Kuwahara. On page 13 of the Office Action, claim 13/12/8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Price, Nakai, Kuwahara, and Mazzara. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Amended independent claims 1, 6, 8, and 11 each recite, *inter alia*, that “the display part is composed of one unit and the analog meter is composed of another unit different from the display part.” Applicant respectfully submits that Price does disclose or render obvious these limitations. *See* Price, Fig. 6 (cited by the Office Action). Nor do the remaining references bridge this gap between the claims and Price. Thus, independent claims 1, 6, 8, and 11, and the remaining claims which depend thereon, are nonobvious over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of the claims.

Accordingly, it is urged that the application, as now amended, is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, Examiner is requested to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Eric M. Shelton

Registration No. 57,630

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 BKS/EMS:amz  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: October 8, 2009**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**